

Hypercontractivity and comparison of moments of iterated maxima and minima of independent random variables

Paweł Hitczenko^{*†}

North Carolina State University

Stanisław Kwapień^{**}

Warsaw University and Texas A& M University

Wenbo V. Li^{*†}

University of Delaware

Gideon Schechtman^{†‡}

Weizmann Institute

Thomas Schlumprecht^{**}

Texas A&M University

Joel Zinn^{*‡*}

Texas A&M University

Summary: We provide necessary and sufficient conditions for hypercontractivity of the minima of nonnegative, i.i.d. random variables and of both the maxima of minima and the minima of maxima for such r.v.'s. It turns out that the idea of hypercontractivity for minima is closely related to small ball probabilities and Gaussian correlation inequalities.

AMS 1991 Subject Classification: Primary 60B11, 60E07, 60E15. Secondary 52A21, 60G15

* Supported in part by an NSF grant

† Participant, NSF Workshop in Linear Analysis & Probability, Texas A&M University

** Supported in part by Polish KBN grant

‡ Supported in part by US-Israel Binational Science Foundation

* Supported in part by a Texas Advanced Research Program grant

Section 1. Introduction.

In this paper we provide necessary and sufficient conditions for hypercontractivity of the minima of nonnegative, i.i.d. random variables of the maxima, the minima and the minima of maxima for such r.v.'s, etc(see the definitions in Section 3). We also give sufficient conditions for hypercontractivity of order statistics. Since questions on “comparison of moments” of minima have, apparently, not been considered in the literature, we would like to detail some of our motivation. The first motivation for considering such results is as follows. In a recent paper of de la Peña, Montgomery-Smith and Szulga (1994), the authors give a pair of conditions which yield decoupling (or comparison) theorems for tail probabilities. One is an L_p decoupling (comparison) condition for maxima of i.i.d. copies of the variables to be compared. The other is a hypercontractivity condition, again for maxima of i.i.d. copies of the “larger” of the two of the r.v.'s. As mentioned the conclusion of their theorem (Theorem 3.5) is a comparison of the tails of the r.v.'s of the following type: There exists a constant, c , such that

$$P(X > ct) \leq cP(Y > t).$$

However, this does not give any information about “small balls” of the variables (i.e. the probabilities $P(X \leq t)$), since $P(Y > t) \geq 1/c$ yields a trivial inequality. It is our goal to obtain comparison results about “small balls” for norms of some Gaussian vectors. One way to achieve this is to prove the tail comparisons for minima of independent copies of the variables with a uniform constant. For example, assume one has the following holding for all n .

$$P(\min_{i \leq n} X_i > ct) \leq cP(\min_{i \leq n} Y_i > t).$$

This leads easily to

$$P(X \leq ct) \geq P(Y \leq t),$$

which compares “small balls”. Conversely, if one has an inequality of the type

$$P(X > ct) \leq P(Y > t),$$

by raising both sides to a power n , one gets an inequality for the minima. Hence, to use their methods it appears that one needs to consider i.i.d. maxima of the variables of interest.

Therefore, in our case one is led to consider i.i.d. maxima of i.i.d. minima. However, the L_p/L_q , $q > p \geq 1$, comparison of the max min of X 's to that of Y 's seems difficult to handle. In this paper we obtain characterizations of the min and max hypercontractivity separately, as well as the fact that each of the max min and min max L_p inequalities are equivalent to the combination of the max L_p inequality and the min L_p inequality.

The second motivation comes from a well known correlation conjecture for symmetric, convex sets with respect to a mean zero Gaussian measure μ on $\mathbb{R}^n$, namely,

$$(1.1) \quad \mu(A \cap B) \geq \mu(A)\mu(B)$$

for any symmetric, convex sets A and B .

In 1977 L. Pitt (1977) proved that the conjecture holds in $\mathbb{R}^2$. Khatri (1967) and Šidák (1967, 1968) proved (1.1) when one of the set is a symmetric slab (a set of the form $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |(x, u)| \leq 1\}$ for some $u \in \mathbb{R}^n$). For more recent work and references on the correlation conjecture, see Schechtman, Schlumprecht and Zinn (1995), and Szarek and Werner (1995). The Khatri-Šidák result as a partial solution to the general correlation conjecture has many applications in probability and statistics, see Tong (1980). In particular, it is one of the most important tools discovered recently for the lower bound estimates of the small ball probabilities, see, for example, Kuelbs, Li and Shao (1995), and Talagrand (1994). On the other hand, the Khatri-Šidák result only provides the correct lower bound rate up to a constant at the log level of the small ball probability. If the correlation conjecture (1.1) holds, then the existence of the constant of the small ball probability at the log level for the fractional Brownian motion (cf. Li and Shao (1995)) can be shown. Thus, from the small ball probability point of view, it is clear that hypercontractivity for minima, small ball probabilities and the correlation inequalities are all related, in particular for Gaussian random vectors. One of our goals in this paper is to expose some of these connections and in particular to introduce the idea of hypercontractivity for minima to attack the correlation conjecture and its implication for small ball probabilities.

The third motivation is related to a weaker form of the correlation conjecture. To set the notation we let $\mathcal{C}_n$ denote the set of symmetric, convex sets in $\mathbb{R}^n$.

Since the correlation conjecture iterates, we consider for $\alpha \geq 1$,

Conjecture C_α . For any $l, n \geq 1$, and any $A_1, \dots, A_l \in \mathcal{C}_n$, if μ is a mean zero, Gaussian measure on $\mathbb{R}^n$, then

$$\mu\left(\alpha\left(\bigcap_{i=1}^l A_i\right)\right) \geq \prod_{i=1}^l \mu(A_i).$$

One can restate this (as well as the original conjecture) using Gaussian vectors in $\mathbb{R}^n$ as follows: for $l, n \geq 1$, and any $A = A_1 \times \dots \times A_l \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{nl}$ let

$\|\cdot\|_A$ = the norm on $\mathbb{R}^{nl}$ with the unit ball A ,

$\|\cdot\|_l$ = the norm on $\mathbb{R}^n$ with the unit ball A_l .

If $G, G_1, \dots, G_l$ are i.i.d. mean zero Gaussian random variables in $\mathbb{R}^n$, let

$$\mathcal{G} = (G, \dots, G) \text{ and } \mathcal{H} = (G_1, \dots, G_l).$$

Then, C_α can be rewritten as:

Restatement of Conjecture C_α . For all $l, n \geq 1$, and any $t > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(\|\mathcal{G}\|_A \leq \alpha t) &= \Pr(\mathcal{G} \in \alpha t(A_1 \times \dots \times A_l)) \\ &\geq \Pr(\mathcal{H} \in t(A_1 \times \dots \times A_l)) = \Pr(\|\mathcal{H}\|_A \leq t). \end{aligned}$$

By taking complements, reversing the inequalities and raising both sides of the inequality to a power, say N , we get:

$$\Pr(\min_{j \leq N} \|\mathcal{G}^j\|_A > \alpha t) \leq \Pr(\min_{j \leq N} \|\mathcal{H}^j\|_A > t).$$

Again, reversing the inequalities and raising both sides to the power K ,

$$\Pr(\max_{k \leq K} \min_{j \leq N} \|\mathcal{G}^{j,k}\|_A > \alpha t) \leq \Pr(\max_{k \leq K} \min_{j \leq N} \|\mathcal{H}^{j,k}\|_A > t).$$

Using the usual formula for p^{th} moments in terms of tail probabilities we would get:

$$(1.2) \quad \left\| \max_{k \leq K} \min_{j \leq N} \|\mathcal{G}^{j,k}\|_A \right\|_p \leq \alpha \left\| \max_{k \leq K} \min_{j \leq N} \|\mathcal{H}^{j,k}\|_A \right\|_p.$$

Note that if the conjecture (1.1) were true then (1.2) would hold with $\alpha = 1$. Even in the case $K = N = 1$, the best that is known is the above inequality with constant $\sqrt{2}$. (Of course, if $N = 1$, the case $K = 1$ is the same as the case of arbitrary K .) To see this first let $T =: \cup_{l=1}^L T_l =: \cup_{l=1}^L \{(f, l) : f \in A_l^\circ\}$ where A_l° is the polar of A_l . Now define the Gaussian processes Y_t and X_t for $t \in T_l$ by $Y_{f,l} = f(G)$ and $X_{f,l} = f(G_l)$. Then, $\sup_{t \in T} Y_t = \max_{l \leq L} \|G\|_l$ and $\sup_{t \in T} X_t = \max_{l \leq L} \|G_l\|_l$. We now check the conditions of the Chevet-Fernique-Sudakov/Tsirelson version of Slepian's inequality (see also, Marcus-Shepp (1972)). Let $s = (f, p)$ and $t = (g, q)$. If $p = q$, (Y_s, Y_t) has the same distribution as (X_s, X_t) , and hence

$$E|Y_s - Y_t|^2 = E|X_s - X_t|^2.$$

If $p \neq q$, then

$$E|Y_s - Y_t|^2 \leq 2 \left(EY_s^2 + EY_t^2 \right) = 2 \left(EX_s^2 + EX_t^2 \right) = 2E|X_s - X_t|^2$$

Therefore, in either case one can use $\sqrt{2}$. Hence, by the version of the Slepian result mentioned above,

$$E \sup_{t \in T} Y_t \leq \sqrt{2} E \sup_{t \in T} X_t.$$

On the other hand the results (mentioned above) of De La P  na, Montgomery-Smith and Szulga on decoupling allow one to go from an L_p inequality to a probability inequality if one has one more ingredient, hypercontractivity. By their results if one can prove that there exists a constant $\gamma < \infty$ such that for all K, N and symmetric, convex sets

$$(\textbf{Comparison}) \quad \left\| \max_{k \leq K} \min_{j \leq N} \|\mathcal{G}^{j,k}\|_A \right\|_p \leq \gamma \left\| \max_{k \leq K} \min_{j \leq N} \|\mathcal{H}^{j,k}\|_A \right\|_p.$$

and for some $q > p$ and all K, N and symmetric, convex sets

$$(\textbf{Hyper-contr}) \quad \left\| \max_{k \leq K} \min_{j \leq N} \|\mathcal{H}^{j,k}\|_A \right\|_q \leq \gamma \left\| \max_{k \leq K} \min_{j \leq N} \|\mathcal{H}^{j,k}\|_A \right\|_p,$$

then one would obtain for some α ,

$$\Pr(\min_{j \leq N} \|\mathcal{G}^j\|_A > \alpha t) \leq \alpha \Pr(\min_{j \leq N} \|\mathcal{H}^j\|_A > t).$$

This easily implies

$$\Pr(\|\mathcal{G}\|_A > \alpha t) \leq \Pr(\|\mathcal{H}\|_A > t).$$

Since the constant outside the probability is now 1 we can take complements and reverse the inequality. Now, unraveling the norm and rewriting in terms of μ we return to the inequality C_α .

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 provides some basic lemmas and notations. Hypercontractivity for minima and some equivalent conditions are given in section 3. Section 4 presents hypercontractivity for maxima in a way suitable for our applications. In section 5, we combine the results in section 3 and 4 to obtain hypercontractivity for minmax and maxmin, and comparison results for the small ball probabilities of possibly different random vectors. We also give a sufficient condition for the comparison of moments of order statistics. In section 6, we apply our results to show that the α symmetric stable random variables with $0 < \alpha \leq 2$ are minmax and maxmin hypercontractive, which is strongly connected to the regularity of the α -stable measure of small balls. In the case of Gaussian random vectors, we show that the modified correlation inequality (C_α) holds if integrated version of (C_α) holds. In the last section, we mention some interesting open problems and final remarks.

Section 2. Notations and Some Basic Lemmas.

For nonnegative i.i.d. r.v.'s $\{Z_j\}$, let $m_n = m_n(Z) = \min_{j \leq n} Z_j$ and $M_n = M_n(Z) = \max_{j \leq n} Z_j$. The r -norm of the random variable W is

$$\|W\|_r = (E|W|^r)^{1/r} \quad \text{for } r > 0$$

We will denote

$$x \wedge y = \min\{x, y\}, \quad x \vee y = \max\{x, y\}.$$

If $s < t$ then $s \vee (x \wedge t) = (s \vee x) \wedge t$ and it is denoted by $s \vee x \wedge t$.

Throughout this paper, the numbers p and q are fixed and $0 < p < q < \infty$.

Lemma 2.1. *Assume $\|W\|_q \leq C\|W\|_p$. Then*

- (a) *for $\alpha = 2^{1/(q-p)}C^{q/(q-p)}$, $EW^p \leq 2EW^p I_{\{W \leq \alpha\|W\|_p\}}$, and*
- (b) *for $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$, $P(W > \lambda\|W\|_p) \geq ((1 - \lambda^p)C^{-p})^{q/(q-p)}$.*

Proof. (a). Note that

$$EW^p I_{\{W > \alpha\|W\|_p\}} \leq E \frac{W^q}{(\alpha\|W\|_p)^{q-p}} \leq \frac{C^q \|W\|_p^p}{\alpha^{q-p}} = \frac{1}{2} EW^p.$$

Thus $EW^p I_{\{W > \alpha\|W\|_p\}} \leq EW^p I_{\{W \leq \alpha\|W\|_p\}}$ and $EW^p \leq 2EW^p I_{\{W \leq \alpha\|W\|_p\}}$.

(b). The result follows from the Paley-Zygmund inequality

$$EW^p \leq a^p + (EW^q)^{p/q} P^{1-p/q}(W > a)$$

with $a = \lambda\|W\|_p$. ■

Lemma 2.2. *Let $0 < \beta < 1$, $0 < x, y < 1$ then*

- (a) *$x \geq \beta^{p/(q-p)}$ and $y^{1/q} \leq x^{1/p}$ imply $(1 - x) \leq \beta^{-1}pq^{-1}(1 - y)$*
- (b) *$pq^{-1}x \geq y$ implies $(1 - x)^{1/q} \leq (1 - y)^{1/p}$.*

Proof. (a). We have

$$1 - y \geq 1 - x^{q/p} = (1 - x)qp^{-1}\eta^{(q-p)/p} \geq (1 - x)qp^{-1}x^{(q-p)/p} \geq (1 - x)qp^{-1}\beta$$

where the equality follows from the mean value theorem with $x \leq \eta \leq 1$.

(b). The conclusion follows from the well known fact $(1 - y)^\alpha \geq 1 - \alpha y$ with $\alpha = q/p > 1$. ■

Lemma 2.3. Fix $0 < p \leq q < \infty$. Let μ and ν be positive measures on S and T , respectively. If $h: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is a measurable function and $\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n$ and $\eta_1, \dots, \eta_n$ are two sequences of independent r.v.'s such that for each i and each $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{i-1}, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_n$ we have

$$(Eh^q(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, \eta_i, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_n))^{1/q} \leq (Eh^p(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, \xi_i, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_n))^{1/p},$$

then

$$(Eh^q(\eta_1, \eta_2, \dots, \eta_n))^{1/q} \leq (Eh^p(\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_n))^{1/p}.$$

Proof. This follows easily by induction and Minkowski's inequality

$$\left(\int_S \left(\int_T |f(s, t)|^p \mu(dt) \right)^{q/p} \nu(ds) \right)^{1/q} \leq \left(\int_T \left(\int_S |f(s, t)|^q \nu(ds) \right)^{p/q} \mu(dt) \right)^{1/p} \quad \blacksquare.$$

Section 3. Hypercontractivity for minima.

Definition 3.1. We say that a nonnegative random variable W is $\{p, q\}$ -min-hypercontractive (with constant C), if there exists C such that for all n ,

$$\|m_n(W)\|_q \leq C \|m_n(W)\|_p.$$

In this case we write $W \in \min \mathcal{H}_{p,q}(C)$.

Lemma 3.2. If $W \in \min \mathcal{H}_{p,q}(C)$ then for each n

$$\|m_n(W)\|_p \leq K \|m_{2n}(W)\|_p \quad \text{with} \quad K = 2^{(2q-p)/p(q-p)} C^{q/(q-p)}.$$

Proof. Let $H(t) = H_{p,n}(t) = E(m_n(W) \wedge t)^p$ and note that $H(t)/t^p$ is nonincreasing. Taking α as in the Lemma 2.1,

$$\|m_{2n}\|_p^p \geq E m_{2n}^p I_{m_n \leq \alpha \|m_n\|_p} = EH(m_n) I_{m_n \leq \alpha \|m_n\|_p}.$$

Since $H(t)/t^p$ is nonincreasing,

$$EH(m_n) I_{m_n \leq \alpha \|m_n\|_p} = E \frac{H(m_n)}{m_n^p} m_n^p I_{m_n \leq \alpha \|m_n\|_p} \geq \frac{H(\alpha \|m_n\|_p)}{(\alpha \|m_n\|_p)^p} E m_n^p I_{m_n \leq \alpha \|m_n\|_p}.$$

Thus by Lemma 2.1,

$$\|m_{2n}\|_p^p \geq \frac{1}{2} \frac{H(\alpha\|m_n\|_p)}{(\alpha\|m_n\|_p)^p} \|m_n\|_p^p.$$

Furthermore,

$$H(\alpha\|m_n\|_p) \geq Em_n^p I_{m_n \leq \alpha\|m_n\|_p} \geq 2^{-1} \|m_n\|_p^p,$$

which gives the conclusion. ■

The following theorem is a min-analog of a result of De La P  na, Montgomery-Smith and Szulga (1994), proved for maxima, (cf. Theorem 4.4 below).

Theorem 3.3. *Let $0 < p < q$, and let X, Y be r.v.'s such that $X \in \min \mathcal{H}_{p,q}(C)$ and there exists a constant B such that $\|m_n(Y)\|_q \leq B\|m_n(X)\|_q$ for all n . Then $P(X \leq \tau t) \leq \delta P(Y \leq t)$ for all $t \leq t_0 = \rho\|X\|_p$ for some constants $0 < \delta < 1$, and $\tau, \rho > 0$.*

Proof. By Markov's inequality

$$tP^{1/q}(m_n(Y) > t) \leq \|m_n(Y)\|_q \leq B\|m_n(X)\|_p.$$

By Lemma 2.1 (b) for each λ , $0 < \lambda < 1$, it is

$$(3.1) \quad P^{1/p}(m_n(X) > \lambda\|m_n(X)\|_p) \geq ((1 - \lambda^p)C^{-p})^{q/p(q-p)} = D.$$

Hence taking $t = t_n = BD^{-1}\|m_n(X)\|_p$ we obtain $P^{1/q}(m_n(Y) > t_n) \leq P^{1/p}(m_n(X) > \lambda B^{-1}Dt_n)$ which gives $P^{1/q}(Y > t_n) \leq P^{1/p}(X > \lambda B^{-1}Dt_n)$ for all n . By Lemmas 2.1 and 3.2 for each $t_{n+1} \leq u \leq t_n$, this yields

$$P^{1/q}(Y > u) \leq P^{1/q}(Y > t_{n+1}) \leq P^{1/p}(X > \lambda DB^{-1}t_{n+1}) \leq P^{1/p}(X > \lambda D(BK)^{-1}u),$$

where K is as in Lemma 3.2. Hence denoting $\lambda D(BK)^{-1}$ by τ we have that $P^{1/q}(Y > u) \leq P^{1/p}(X > \tau u)$ is satisfied for all u such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} t_n < u \leq t_1 = BD^{-1}\|X\|_p$. If $u \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} t_n$, then $P(X > \tau u) = 1$ and the above inequality holds true for the obvious reasons. This inequality and Lemma 2.2 (a) imply that if $p/q < \beta < 1$ and $P(X > \tau u) \geq \beta^{p/(q-p)}$ then

$$P(X \leq \tau u) \leq (pq^{-1}\beta^{-1}) P(Y \leq u) \quad \text{for } u \leq BD^{-1}\|X\|_p.$$

Let us observe that by (3.1) for each n

$$P(X > \lambda \|m_{2^n}(X)\|_p) \geq D^{p/2^n}$$

and hence by Lemma 3.2

$$P(X > \lambda K^{-n} \|X\|_p) \geq D^{p/2^n}.$$

Therefore $P(X > \tau s) \geq \beta^{p/(q-p)}$ if $s \leq \tau^{-1} K^{-n} \lambda \|X\|_p$ and n is such that $D^{p/2^n} \geq \beta^{p/(q-p)}$.

Thus, for $\tau = \lambda D(KB)^{-1}$ we can choose δ to be any number from the interval $(pq^{-1}\beta^{-1}, 1)$ and then ρ can be taken to be equal $\min\{BD^{-1}, \tau^{-1}\lambda K^{-n}\}$ where n is any integer such that $D \geq \beta^{2^n/(q-p)}$. With this choice the assertion of the theorem is satisfied for all $0 \leq t \leq t_0 = \rho \|X\|_p$. ■

In the above theorem, it is important to note that the constants ρ, τ, δ depend, modulo the given parameters β and λ , only on p, q, C, B . On the other hand, in the following theorem, it is important to note that each constant appearing in the conditions (i) – (iv) of that theorem depends only on p, q and the constants from the equivalent conditions, e.g., in particular they do not depend on the random variable X . This will be useful when considering hypercontractivity of maxima of minima in section 5.

Theorem 3.4. *Let X be a nonnegative r.v. such that $\|X\|_q < \infty$ and let $0 < p < q$. The following conditions are equivalent*

- (i) $X \in \min \mathcal{H}_{p,q}(C)$ for some C ,
- (ii) there exist $\varepsilon < 1$, $\tau, \rho > 0$ such that

$$P(X \leq \tau t) \leq \varepsilon P(X \leq t) \quad \text{for all } t \leq t_0 = \rho \|X\|_p,$$

- (iii) for each $\varepsilon > 0, \rho > 0$, there exists $\tau > 0$ such that

$$P(X \leq \tau t) \leq \varepsilon P(X \leq t) \quad \text{for all } t \leq t_0 = \rho \|X\|_p,$$

- (iv) there exists $\sigma > 0$ such that

$$(3.2) \quad (E(t \wedge \sigma X)^q)^{1/q} \leq (E(t \wedge X)^p)^{1/p} \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0.$$

Proof. (i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii). This implication follows immediately by Theorem 3.3 applied to $Y = X$.

(ii) $\Rightarrow$ (iii). If τ, ε, t_0 are as in (ii) then by induction we obtain for each n ,

$$P(X \leq \tau^n t_0 t_1^{-1} t) \leq \varepsilon^n P(X \leq t_0 t_1^{-1} t) \leq \varepsilon^n P(X \leq t)$$

for all $t \leq t_1$, where t_1 is any fixed number such that $t_1 \geq t_0$.

(iii) $\Rightarrow$ (iv). For each t, σ and r , $0 < r < 1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} (E(t \wedge \sigma X)^q)^{1/q} &\leq (t^q P(X > r\sigma^{-1}t) + r^q t^q P(X \leq r\sigma^{-1}t))^{1/q} \\ &= t (1 - (1 - r^q) P(X \leq r\sigma^{-1}t))^{1/q}. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand

$$(E(t \wedge X)^p)^{1/p} \geq t P^{1/p}(X > t) = t(1 - P(X \leq t))^{1/p}.$$

Therefore, by Lemma 2.2 (b) the inequality (3.2) is satisfied if

$$P(X \leq t) \leq pq^{-1}(1 - r^q)P(X \leq r\sigma^{-1}t).$$

Thus if $\varepsilon = pq^{-1}(1 - r^q)$, τ, t_0 are as in (iii), then the above inequality and hence (3.2) is fulfilled for $t \leq \tau t_0$ and $\sigma \leq r\tau$.

If $t > \tau t_0$ then $(E(t \wedge \sigma X)^q)^{1/q} \leq \sigma \|X\|_q$ and $(E(t \wedge X^p)^{1/p} \geq (E(\tau t_0 \wedge X)^p)^{1/p}$ and therefore it is enough to choose $\sigma = \min \{(E(\tau t_0 \wedge X)^p)^{1/p} / \|X\|_q, \tau r\}$ to have the inequality (3.2) be satisfied for all $t \geq 0$.

(iv) $\Rightarrow$ (i). Applying Lemma 2.3 to $h(x_1, \dots, x_n) = x_1 \wedge \dots \wedge x_n$, $\xi_i = X_i$ and $\eta_i = \sigma X_i$, we get (iv) $\Rightarrow$ (i) with $C = \sigma^{-1}$. ■

Remark 3.5. It follows by Theorem 3.4 that $\{p, q\}$ -min-hypercontractivity depends only on the existence of the q -moment and a regularity property of the distribution function at 0, i.e. the following property, which we will call subregularity of X (or, more precisely, of the distribution of X) at 0,

$$\lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{P(X \leq \tau t)}{P(X \leq t)} = 0.$$

Theorem 3.6. Fix $q > 1$. If $\{X_i\}_{i \leq n}$ is i.i.d sequence of nonnegative r.v.'s with the common distribution function subregular at 0, and such that $E\|X_1\|^q < \infty$, then there

exists a constant σ such that for each n , and each function $h: \mathbb{R}_+^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ which is concave in each variable separately, we have

$$(Eh^q(\sigma X_1, \sigma X_2, \dots, \sigma X_n))^{1/q} \leq Eh(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n).$$

Proof. By Lemma 2.3 it is enough to prove that there exists $\sigma > 0$, such that for each concave $g: \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, $(Eg^q(\sigma X))^{1/q} \leq Eg(X)$. To see this we first note that by Theorem 3.4, X is $\{q, 1\}$ -min-hypercontractive, therefore there exists $\sigma > 0$ such that $(Eh_t^q(\sigma X))^{1/q} \leq Eh_t(X)$ for each $t \geq 0$, where h_t is given by $h_t(x) = x \wedge t$.

Since for each concave $g: \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ there exists a measure μ on $\mathbb{R}_+$ (the measure μ is given by the condition $\mu((x, y]) = g'_+(x) - g'_+(y)$ where $g'_+(x)$ is the right derivative of g at x) such that $g = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} h_t \mu(dt) + g(0)$ the theorem follows by the Minkowski's inequality.

■

Corollary 3.7. *If $\{X_i\}$, h , q are as in Theorem 3.6 and, additionally, h is α -homogeneous for some $\alpha > 0$ (i.e. $h(tx) = t^\alpha h(x)$), then the random variable, $W = h(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n)$, is subregular at 0.*

Proof. Theorem 3.6 implies that W is $\{q, 1\}$ -min-hypercontractive and the result follows by Theorem 3.4. ■

Section 4. Hypercontractivity of maxima

In this section we treat the case of maxima in a way similar to that of minima in Section 3. However there are some essential differences which do not allow us to treat these two cases together.

Definition 4.1. We say that a nonnegative r.v. W is $\{p, q\}$ -max-hypercontractive if there exists a constant C such that for all n

$$\|M_n(W)\|_q \leq C\|M_n(W)\|_p.$$

We will write, $W \in \max \mathcal{H}_{p,q}(C)$ in this case.

Lemma 4.2. Let $\{X_i\}$ be i.i.d. nonnegative r.v.'s. Then

$$\frac{nP(X > t)}{1 + nP(X > t)} \leq P(M_n > t) \leq nP(X > t).$$

Proof. The right side is obvious and the left follows by taking complements and using the inequality, $nu/(1 + nu) \leq 1 - (1 - u)^n$. ■

Proposition 4.3. Let $\{X_i\}$ be i.i.d nonnegative r.v.'s. Then for $a > 0$,

$$(a) \quad NP(M_N \leq a)EX^r I_{X>a} \leq \left(\frac{1 - P^N(X \leq a)}{P(X > a)}\right)EX^r I_{X>a} \leq EM_N^r.$$

If b_N satisfies $P(X > b_N) \leq N^{-1} \leq P(X \geq b_N)$, then

$$(b) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \left(b_N^r + N \int_{b_N}^{\infty} ru^{r-1} P(X > u) du \right) &\leq EM_N^r \leq \inf \{ a^r + N \int_a^{\infty} ru^{r-1} P(X > u) du \} \\ &\leq b_N^r + N \int_{b_N}^{\infty} ru^{r-1} P(X > u) du \end{aligned}$$

Proof. (a) Let $\tau = \inf\{j \leq n : X_j > a\}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} E \max_{j \leq N} X_j^r &\geq E(X_\tau; \tau \leq N) = \sum_{j=1}^N E(X_j^r I_{X_j > a} I_{\max_{i < j} X_i \leq a}) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^N P^{j-1}(X \leq a) EX^r I_{X>a} = \left(\frac{1 - P^N(X \leq a)}{P(X > a)}\right) EX^r I_{X>a} \\ &\geq NP(M_{N-1} \leq a) EX^r I_{X>a} \end{aligned}$$

(b) To see the right hand inequality, just note that

$$EM_N^r = \left(\int_0^a + \int_a^\infty \right) ru^{r-1} P(M_N \geq u) du \leq a^r + \int_a^\infty ru^{r-1} P(M_N \geq u) du.$$

For the left hand inequality, we again break up the integral as above and using the defining properties of b_N as well as the monotonicity of $x/(1+x)$ in Lemma 4.2:

$$\begin{aligned} EM_N^r &= \left(\int_0^{b_N} + \int_{b_N}^\infty \right) ru^{r-1} P(M_N \geq u) du \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{b_N} ru^{r-1} dr + \frac{N}{2} \int_{b_N}^\infty ru^{r-1} P(X \geq u) du. \quad \blacksquare \end{aligned}$$

Rychlik (1993) obtained an extension of Theorem 3.5 of De La Peña, Montgomery-Smith and Szulga (cf. Asmar, Montgomery-Smith (1993)). In the next theorem we put more emphasis on the dependence of the constants.

Theorem 4.4. *Let $0 < p < q$ and let $X \in \max \mathcal{H}_{p,q}(C)$. Let Y be a nonnegative r.v. If there exists a constant D such that $\|M_n(Y)\|_q \leq D\|M_n(X)\|_q$ for all n , then there are constants A, B, ρ such that*

$$EY^q I(Y > At) \leq B^q t^q P(X > t) \quad \text{for all } t \geq t_0 = \rho \|X\|_p.$$

The constants B, A, t_0 can be chosen in the following way: if $0 < \lambda < 1$, we put $A = 2^{(q+1)/q} CD \lambda^{-1}$, $B = A(C^p(1 - \lambda^p))^{1/(q-p)}$ and $t_0 = \lambda \|Y\|_p$.

Proof. First we note that by the Paley-Zygmund inequality,

$$(4.1) \quad ((1 - \lambda^p)C^{-p})^{q/(q-p)} \leq P(M_n(X) > \lambda \|M_n(X)\|_p) \leq nP(X > \lambda \|M_n(X)\|_p).$$

We next note that by Markov's inequality and the assumptions, for $\rho = 2^{1/q} CD$,

$$P(M_n(Y) \leq \rho \|M_n(X)\|_p) \geq P(M_n(Y) \leq \rho(CD)^{-1} \|M_n(Y)\|_q) \geq 1/2.$$

Now, by Proposition 4.3, (a), the assumptions above and (4.1),

$$EY^q I_{Y > \rho \|M_n(X)\|_p} \leq 2(CD)^q \|M_n(X)\|_p^q (C^p(1 - \lambda^p)^{-1})^{q/(q-p)} P(X > \lambda \|M_n(X)\|_p).$$

Since $\|M_{2n}(X)\|_p \leq 2\|M_n(X)\|_p$, we get by interpolation that

$$EY^q I_{Y>2\rho t/\lambda} \leq B^q t^q P(X > t)$$

for

$$B^q = 2^{q+1} (CD\lambda^{-1})^q (C^p(1-\lambda^p)^{-1})^{q/(q-p)}$$

as long as $\lambda\|X\|_p \leq 2t < \lambda \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|M_n(X)\|_p = \lambda\|X\|_\infty$. If $2t \geq \lambda\|X\|_\infty$, then since $\rho \geq D$, and

$$\|Y\|_\infty = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|M_n(Y)\|_q \leq D \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|M_n(X)\|_q = D\|X\|_\infty,$$

$EY^q I_{Y>2\rho t/\lambda} = 0$. The conclusion follows trivially. ■

Remark 4.5. Theorem 4.4 yields immediately that

$$P(Y > At) \leq B^q P(X > t) \quad \text{for } t \geq t_0.$$

Theorem 4.6. *Let X be a nonnegative r.v., $p < q$. The following conditions are equivalent*

- (i) $X \in \max \mathcal{H}_{p,q}(C)$ for some $C > 0$;
- (ii) for each $\rho > 0$ there exists a constant B such that

$$EX^q I(X > t) \leq B^q t^q P(X > t) \quad \text{for all } t \geq t_0 = \rho\|X\|_p;$$

- (iii) for each $\rho, \varepsilon > 0$ there exists a constant $D > 1$ such that

$$D^q P(X > Dt) \leq \varepsilon P(X > t) \quad \text{for all } t \geq t_0 = \rho\|X\|_p;$$

- (iv) there exists a constant $\sigma > 0$ such that

$$E(t \vee \sigma X)^q)^{1/q} \leq (E(t \vee X)^p)^{1/p} \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0.$$

Proof. (i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii). By Theorem 4.4 applied to $Y = X$ we derive an existence of constants $A, \overline{B}, \bar{t}_0$ such that

$$EX^q I(X > t) \leq \overline{B}^q t^q P(X > t) \quad \text{for all } t \geq \bar{t}_0.$$

Hence for any $t \geq t_0$, where t_0 is any number > 0 ,

$$\begin{aligned} EX^q I(X > At) &\leq EX^q I(X > A(t \vee \bar{t}_0)) + EX^q I(t < X \leq A(t \vee \bar{t}_0)) \\ &\leq \bar{B}^q (t \vee \bar{t}_0)^q P(X > t \vee \bar{t}_0) + A^q (t \vee \bar{t}_0)^q P(X > t) \\ &\leq (1 \vee (\bar{t}_0/t_0)^q) (\bar{B}^q + A^q) t^q P(X > t). \end{aligned}$$

(ii) $\Rightarrow$ (iii). If t_0, B are as in (ii) then for $t \geq t_0$

$$\begin{aligned} EX^q \ln^+ X/t &= \int_t^\infty E \frac{X^q I(X > s)}{s} ds \leq B^q \int_t^\infty s^{q-1} P(X > s) ds \leq q^{-1} B^q EX^q I(X > t) \\ &\leq q^{-1} B^q t^q P(X > t). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, for any $D > 1$ we have

$$(\ln D) D^q t^q P(X > Dt) \leq EX^q \ln^+ X/t \leq q^{-1} B^{2q} t^q P(X > t)$$

and it is enough to choose $D > 1$ such that $B^{2q}/(q \ln D) < \varepsilon$.

(iii) $\Rightarrow$ (ii). If (iii) holds with $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, $D > 1$ and $t_0 > 0$ then by induction $P(X > D^n t) \leq \varepsilon^n D^{-nq} P(X > t)$ for $t \geq t_0$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} EX^q I(X > t) &= \sum_{k=0}^\infty EX^q I(D^k t < X \leq D^{k+1} t) \leq \sum_{k=0}^\infty D^{(k+1)q} t^q P(X > D^k t) \\ &\leq \sum_{k=0}^\infty D^{(k+1)q} t^q \cdot \varepsilon^k D^{-kq} P(X > t) = D^q (1 - \varepsilon)^{-1} t^q P(X > t). \end{aligned}$$

(ii) and (iii) $\Rightarrow$ (iv). Assume that (ii) and (iii) are fulfilled with constants B, D, ε, t_0 .

By (ii) we obtain for $t \geq t_0 \sigma$, where at the moment σ is any number < 1 ,

$$\begin{aligned} (E(t \vee \sigma X)^q)^{1/q} &\leq t \left(P(X < t\sigma^{-1}) + \sigma^q t^{-q} E(X^q I(X \geq t\sigma^{-1})) \right)^{1/q} \\ &\leq t (1 + (B^q - 1) P(X \geq t\sigma^{-1}))^{1/q} \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand for any $R > 1$

$$(E(t \vee X)^p)^{1/p} \geq t(1 + (R^p - 1)P(X > Rt))^{1/p}.$$

Hence by Lemma 2.2 (b) the inequality in (iv) holds if

$$pq^{-1}(B^q - 1)(R^p - 1)^{-1} P(X \geq t\sigma^{-1}) \leq P(X > Rt).$$

Therefore if we choose R so that

$$pq^{-1}(B^q - 1)(R^p - 1)^{-1} < D^q/\varepsilon, \quad R\|X\|_p/2 \geq t_0 \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma < (RD)^{-1},$$

then the inequality in (iv) is satisfied for all $t \geq \|X\|_p/2$.

If $t < \|X\|_p/2$ then $(E(t \vee \sigma X)^q)^{1/q} \leq t + \sigma\|X\|_q$ and $(E(t \vee X)^p)^{1/p} \geq \|X\|_p$ and therefore if additionally $\sigma < \|X\|_p(2\|X\|_q)^{-1}$ then the inequality in (iv) is satisfied for all $t \geq 0$.

(iv) $\Rightarrow$ (i). This implication is proved in the same way as the one in Theorem 3.4. It is enough to replace $\wedge$ by $\vee$ everywhere. $\blacksquare$

As in Theorem 3.4 for fixed p, q the constants in the conditions (i) – (iv) depend only on themselves.

Remark 4.7.

- (i) The equivalence of (ii) and (iii) in Theorem 4.6 can be deduced from more general results (cf. Bingham, Goldie and Teugels).
- (ii) It follows from Theorem 4.4 that if X is $\{p, q\}$ max-hypercontractive then for some $\varepsilon > 0$ and all $r < q + \varepsilon$, X is also $\{r, q + \varepsilon\}$ -max-hypercontractive.
- (iii) The property of $\{p, q\}$ -max-hypercontractivity is equivalent to

$$\limsup_{D \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{D^q P(X > Dt)}{P(X > t)} = 0$$

which we will call q -subregularity at $+\infty$.

Theorem 4.8. *If a nonnegative r.v. X is q -subregular at $+\infty$ then there exists a constant σ such that for each n and each $X_i, i = 1, \dots, n$ independent copies of X ,*

$$(Eh^q(\sigma X_1, \sigma X_2, \dots, \sigma X_n))^{1/q} \leq Eh(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n)$$

for each function $h: \mathbb{R}_+^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ which is in each variable separately nondecreasing and convex, and $\lim_{x_i \rightarrow +\infty} (x_i \frac{\partial h}{\partial x_i}(x) - h(x)) \leq 0$.

Proof. The proof is the same as in the case of Theorem 3.6, except that we have to replace everywhere $\wedge$ by $\vee$ and that the measure μ is given by $\mu((x, y]) = g'_+(y) - g'_+(x)$ and then

$$g(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} h_t(x) \mu(dt) + \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} (g(t) - tg'(t)). \quad \blacksquare$$

In analogy to Corollary 3.7 we obtain

Corollary 4.9. *If $\{X_i\}$, h are as in Theorem 4.8, $q > 1$ and in an addition h is α -homogeneous for some $\alpha > 0$, then the random variable $W = h(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n)$ is q -subregular at $+\infty$.*

Section 5. Hypercontractivity of minmax and maxmin.

In this section we will impose on X both the condition of subregularity at 0 and that of q -subregularity at $+\infty$.

Lemma 5.1. *Assume that X is a nonnegative random variable which is subregular at 0 and q -subregular at $+\infty$. Then for each $0 < p < q$ there exists a constant $\sigma > 0$ such that for each $0 < s < t < \infty$*

$$(5.1) \quad (E(s \vee \sigma X \wedge t)^q)^{1/q} \leq (E(s \vee X \wedge t)^p)^{1/p}.$$

Proof. Let $R > 1$ be any fixed number, and let $r = R^{-1}$. Let t_0 be any positive number, and let τ be such that the inequality in Theorem 3.4 (iii) holds for $\varepsilon = pq^{-1}(1 - r^q)$ for all $t \leq t_0$. Then let $\alpha = 2^{-1}(E(\tau \wedge (X/t_0))^p)^{1/p}$. The constant B is such that the inequality in Theorem 4.6 (ii) is true for all $t \geq t_0$ and let D be such that the inequality in Theorem 4.6 (iii) is satisfied for

$$\varepsilon = qp^{-1}(R^p - 1)((B^q - 1)^{-1} \wedge (R^q - 1)^{-1}) \quad \text{for } t \geq t_0.$$

We will show that for $\sigma = \min\{\alpha t_0/\|X\|_q, \alpha/D, r/D, r\tau\}$ the inequality (5.1) holds true for each $0 < s < t < \infty$. Consider the following five cases.

Case 1. $s \leq \alpha t_0, t \geq \tau t_0$. We have

$$(E(s \vee \sigma X \wedge t)^q)^{1/q} \leq \alpha t_0 + \sigma \|X\|_q$$

and

$$(E(s \vee X \wedge t)^p)^{1/p} \geq (E(\tau t_0 \wedge X)^p)^{1/p}.$$

Since $\sigma < \alpha t_0/\|X\|_q$ the inequality holds by the choice of α .

Case 2. $t \leq \tau t_0$, $rt > s$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} (E(s \vee \sigma X \wedge t)^q)^{1/q} &\leq (t^q P(X > r\sigma^{-1}t) + r^q t^q P(X \leq rt\sigma^{-1}))^{1/q} \\ &\leq t(1 + (r^q - 1)P(X \leq rt\sigma^{-1}))^{1/q} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(E(s \vee X \wedge t)^p)^{1/p} \geq t(1 - P(X \leq t))^{1/p}.$$

Therefore by Lemma 2.2 (b) the inequality (5.1) holds if

$$pq^{-1}(1 - r^q)P(X \leq rt\sigma^{-1}) \geq P(X \leq t)$$

which is true by the choice of τ since $\sigma < r\tau$, $t \leq \tau t_0$.

Case 3. $t \leq \tau t_0$, $rt \leq s$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} (E(s \vee \sigma X \wedge t)^q)^{1/q} &\leq (s^q P(X \leq s\sigma^{-1}) + t^q P(X > s\sigma^{-1}))^{1/q} \\ &= t(1 + ((s/t)^q - 1)P(X \leq s\sigma^{-1}))^{1/q} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} (E(s \vee X \wedge t)^p)^{1/p} &\geq (s^p P(X \leq t) + t^p P(X > t))^{1/p} \\ &= t(1 + ((s/t)^p - 1)P(X \leq t))^{1/p}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore by Lemma 2.2 (b) to have (5.1) it is enough to show

$$pq^{-1}(1 - (s/t)^q)(1 - (s/t)^p)^{-1}P(X \leq s\sigma^{-1}) \geq P(X \leq t).$$

Since the function $(1 - x^q)/(1 - x^p)$ is increasing on $\mathbb{R}_+$ and $s/t \geq r$ it is enough to prove that $pq^{-1}(1 - r^q)(1 - r^p)^{-1}P(X \leq rt\sigma^{-1}) \geq P(X \leq t)$ which was proved in the preceding case, because $1 - r^p < 1$.

Case 4. $s > \alpha t_0$, $t > Rs$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} (E(s \vee \sigma X \wedge t)^q)^{1/q} &\leq (s^q P(X \leq s\sigma^{-1}) + \sigma^q EX^q I(X > s\sigma^{-1}))^{1/q} \\ &\leq s(1 + (B^q - 1)P(X > s\sigma^{-1}))^{1/q}, \end{aligned}$$

which follows by the choice of B , since $s\sigma^{-1} > \alpha t_0 \sigma^{-1} \geq t_0$, and

$$\begin{aligned} (E(s \vee X \wedge t)^p)^{1/p} &\geq (s^p P(X \leq Rs) + (Rs)^p P(X > Rs))^{1/p} \\ &= s(1 + (R^p - 1)P(X > Rs))^{1/p}. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 2.2 (b) it is enough that

$$pq^{-1}(B^q - 1)(R^p - 1)^{-1}P(X > s\sigma^{-1}) \leq P(X > Rs)$$

since $\sigma \leq (\alpha \wedge r)/D$ it is enough to show

$$\frac{P(X > D(\alpha^{-1} \vee R)s)}{P(X > Rs)} \leq qp^{-1}(R^p - 1)(B^q - 1)^{-1} = \varepsilon.$$

But, then by the choice of D we have

$$\frac{P(X > D(\alpha^{-1} \vee R)s)}{P(X > Rs)} \leq \frac{P(X > D(\alpha^{-1} \vee R)s)}{P(X > (\alpha^{-1} \vee R)s)} \frac{P(X > (\alpha^{-1} \vee R)s)}{P(X > Rs)} \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{D^q} < \varepsilon,$$

because $(\alpha^{-1} \vee R)s \geq t_0$.

Case 5. $s > \alpha t_0, t \leq Rs$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} (E(s \vee \sigma X \wedge t)^q)^{1/q} &\leq (s^q P(X \leq s\sigma^{-1}) + t^q P(X > s\sigma^{-1}))^{1/q} \\ &= s(1 + ((t/s)^q - 1)P(X > s\sigma^{-1}))^{1/q} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} (E(s \vee X \wedge t)^p)^{1/p} &\geq (s^p P(X \leq t) + t^p P(X > t))^{1/p} \\ &= s(1 + ((t/s)^p - 1)P(X > t))^{1/p}. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 2.2 (b) it is enough to prove

$$pq^{-1}((t/s)^q - 1)((t/s)^p - 1)^{-1}P(X > s\sigma^{-1}) \leq P(X \geq Rs).$$

Since $t/s \leq R$ it suffices to show that

$$pq^{-1}(R^q - 1)(R^p - 1)^{-1}P(X > s\sigma^{-1}) \leq P(X \geq Rs)$$

which is shown in the same way as in the preceding. $\blacksquare$

Taking into account the remarks before the proof of Theorem 3.4 and after Theorem 4.6 we check easily that given p, q the constant σ depends only on the min and max hypercontractivity constants of X . More exactly if we define $\min \max \mathcal{H}_{p,q}(C)$ as the intersection of $\min \mathcal{H}_{p,q}(C)$ and $\max \mathcal{H}_{p,q}(C)$ then for a random variable $X \in \min \max \mathcal{H}_{p,q}(C)$ the constant σ depends only on p, q and C .

Corollary 5.2. *If X, p, q are as in Lemma 5.1, then there exists a constant C such that if (X_i) , $i = 1, \dots, n$ is a sequence of independent copies of X and $X^{k,n}$ denotes the k -th order statistics of the sequence (X_i) , $i = 1, \dots, n$ then $\|X^{k,n}\|_q \leq C\|X^{k,n}\|_p$ and $X^{k,n}$ is q -subregular at $+\infty$ and subregular at 0 .*

Proof. The statistic $X^{k,n}$ can be written as $h(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n)$ where for each i and each fixed $x_i, \dots, x_{i-1}, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_n$ the function $f(x_i) = h(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{i-1}, x_i, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_n) = (s \vee x_i \wedge t)$ for some $0 < s < t$, and all $x_i \in \mathbb{R}_+$. And therefore the first part of the corollary follows by the observation. The second part is obtained easily because we have that $X^{k,n}$ is $\{q, p\}$ -max and min hypercontractive. ■

The preceding corollary can be considerably generalized. At first let us define a class $\mathcal{F}$ of functions $g: \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ which can be written as $g(x) = \int_{\Delta} h_{s,t}(x) \mu(ds, dt)$ for some positive measure μ on $\Delta = \{(s, t) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+ : s \leq t\}$ and where $h_{s,t}$ are functions defined by $h_{s,t}(x) = s \vee x \wedge t$. It is possible to give intrinsic description of functions in $\mathcal{F}$. Instead let us observe that if f is twice continuously differentiable on $\mathbb{R}_+$ then $f \in \mathcal{F}$ if and only if for each $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$, $0 \leq xf'(x) \leq f(x)$ and $f(0) \geq \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} x(f''(x) \vee 0)dx$. In this case the measure μ is given by the following condition: for measurable $h: \Delta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$

$$\int_{\Delta} h(s, t) \mu(ds, dt) = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \left(\sum_{(s,t) \in I(y)} h(s, t) \right) dy$$

where $I(y)$ is the countable family of open, disjoint intervals with the union equal $\{s \in \mathbb{R}_+ : f'(s) > y\}$. It is not difficult to prove that we have the representation $f(x) = \int_{\Delta} h_{s,t}(x) \mu(ds, dt) + c$ where $c = f(0) - \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} x(f''(x) \vee 0)dx$.

Theorem 5.3. *If X is a q -subregular at $+\infty$ and subregular at 0 then there exists a constant $\sigma > 0$ such that for each n and each $h: \mathbb{R}_+^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ which in each variable, separately is in class $\mathcal{F}$ we have*

$$(Eh^q(\sigma X_1, \sigma X_2, \dots, \sigma X_n))^{1/q} \leq Eh(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n).$$

Moreover if h is α -homogeneous for some $\alpha > 0$ then $h(X_1, \dots, X_n)$ is q -subregular at $+\infty$ and subregular at 0 .

Proof. The proof follows the same pattern as proofs of Theorems 3.6, 4.8 and Corollaries 3.7, 4.9, and is based on Lemma 5.1 ■

Applying comparison results of Theorems 3.3 and 4.4 we obtain easily

Theorem 5.4. *Let X, Y be nonnegative r.v.'s such that X is $\{p, q\}$ -min and max hypercontractive. If there exists a constant B such that $\|m_n(Y)\|_q \leq B\|m_n(X)\|_q$ and $\|M_n(Y)\|_q \leq B\|M_n(X)\|_q$ for all n , then there exists a constant D such that $P(Y \leq t) \geq P(DX \leq t)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$.*

Finally we have

Theorem 5.5. *If $X \in \min \mathcal{H}_{p,q} \cap \max \mathcal{H}_{p,q}$ then, there exists a constant D such that for all l and all $n_1, k_1, n_2, k_2, \dots, n_l, k_l$,*

$$\|M_{n_1} m_{k_1} M_{n_2} m_{k_2} \dots M_{n_l} m_{k_l}(X)\|_q \leq D \|M_{n_1} m_{k_1} M_{n_2} m_{k_2} \dots M_{n_l} m_{k_l}(X)\|_p.$$

Proof. If X is both min-hypercontractive and max-hypercontractive then, by Remarks 3.5 and 4.7(ii) it is subregular at 0 and q -subregular at $+\infty$. The result now follows from Lemma 5.1 and Lemma 2.3 applied to appropriately chosen function $h: \mathbb{R}^{n_1 k_1 \dots n_l k_l} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$.

■

Section 6. Minmax hypercontractivity of norms of stable random vectors.

In this section we apply the results in early sections to certain questions concerning Gaussian and symmetric stable measures.

The following lemma is a consequence of Kanter's inequality, (cf. Ledoux and Talagrand (1991), p. 153) which can be viewed as a concentration result similar to Levy's inequalities. The formulation of the lemma below for Gaussian measures was suggested by X. Fernique.

Lemma 6.1 (Corollary of Kanter's inequality). *Let ν be a symmetric α stable measure with $0 < \alpha \leq 2$ on a separable Banach space F . Then, for any $\kappa \geq 0$, any symmetric, convex set B and any $y \in F$, we have*

$$\nu(\kappa B + y) \leq \frac{3}{2} \frac{\kappa^{\alpha/2}}{\sqrt{1 - \nu(B)}}.$$

Proof. Let $\{X, X_i\}_i$ be i.i.d. symmetric α stable random variables with $0 < \alpha \leq 2$. Take $N = \lceil \kappa^{-\alpha} \rceil$. Then using $N\kappa^\alpha \leq 1$ and $(N+1)\kappa^\alpha > 1$, we have by Kanter's inequality

$$\begin{aligned} P(X - y \in \kappa B) &= P\left(\sum_{i=1}^N X_i - N^{1/\alpha} y \in N^{1/\alpha} \kappa B\right) \\ &\leq \frac{3}{2} \left(\frac{1}{1 + NP(X \notin N^{1/\alpha} \kappa B)} \right)^{1/2} \leq \frac{3}{2} \frac{\kappa^{\alpha/2}}{P(X \notin B)^{1/2}} \end{aligned}$$

since $P(X \notin N^{1/\alpha} \kappa B) \geq P(X \notin B)$ and $(1 + NP(X \notin B))^{-1} \leq \kappa^\alpha P^{-1}(X \notin B)$. This finishes the proof. ■

Lemma 6.2. *Let ν be a symmetric α stable measure with $0 < \alpha \leq 2$ on a separable, Banach space F . Then for any closed, symmetric, convex set $B \subseteq F$, $y \in F$ and $\kappa \leq 1$,*

$$\nu(\kappa B + y) \leq R \kappa^{\alpha/2} \nu(2B + y),$$

where $R = (3/2)(\nu(B))^{-1}(1 - \nu(B))^{-1/2}$.

Proof. First consider $y \in B$. Then $\nu(B) \leq \nu(2B + y)$ since $B \subseteq 2B + y$. Thus, to conclude this case, one applies Lemma 6.1.

If $y \notin B$, then let $r = \lceil \kappa^{-1} - 2^{-1} \rceil$. For $k = 0, 1, \dots, r$ the balls $\{y_k + \kappa B\}$ are disjoint and contained in $y + 2B$, where $y_k = (1 - 2\kappa\|y\|^{-1}k)y$. By Anderson's Theorem, it follows that

$$\nu(y_k + \kappa B) \geq \nu(y + \kappa B)$$

for $k = 0, \dots, r$. Therefore, $\nu(\kappa B + y) \leq (r + 1)^{-1}\nu(2B + y) \leq \kappa\nu(2B + y)$. This proves the lemma, since $2 \leq R$. ■

Proposition 6.3. *Under the set up of Lemma 6.2, we have for each $\kappa, t \leq 1$,*

$$\nu(\kappa t B) \leq R' \kappa^{\alpha/2} \nu(tB),$$

where $R' = 3(\nu(B/2))^{-1}(1 - \nu(B/2))^{-1/2}$.

Proof. Now for any $0 \leq t \leq 1$, define the probability measure ν_t by $\nu_t(C) = \nu(tC) = P(X/t \in C)$ where X is the symmetric α stable random variable with law ν . Then

$$\nu * \nu_s(C) = P(X + X'/s \in C) = P((1 + s^{-\alpha})^{1/\alpha} X \in C) = \nu_t(C),$$

where $t^{-\alpha} = 1 + s^{-\alpha}$ and X' is an independent copy of X . Hence, by Lemma 6.2

$$\begin{aligned} \nu(\kappa t B) &= \nu * \nu_s(\kappa B) = \int_F \nu(2\kappa B/2 + y) \nu_s(dy) \leq (2\kappa)^{\alpha/2} R \int_F \nu(B + y) \nu_s(dy) \\ &\leq R' \kappa^{\alpha/2} \nu(tB). \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 6.4. *Under the set up of Lemma 6.2, for each $b < 1$, there exists $R(b)$ such that for all $0 \leq t \leq 1$,*

$$(6.1) \quad \nu(tB) \leq R(b)t^{\alpha/2}\nu(B), \text{ whenever } \nu(B) \leq b.$$

Proof. Fix B with $\nu(B) \leq b$. Choose $s \geq 1$ so that $\nu(sB) = b$. Now, apply the Proposition 6.3 with $\kappa = t$, to get

$$\nu(tB) = \nu\left(t \cdot \frac{1}{2s}(2sB)\right) \leq R(b)t^{\alpha/2}\nu\left(\frac{1}{2s}(2sB)\right) = R(b)t^{\alpha/2}\nu(B),$$

where $R(b) = 3b^{-1}(1 - b)^{-1/2}$. ■

Remark 6.5. In the case of $\alpha = 2$ Theorem 6.4 was formulated in Szarek (1991), Lemma 2.6, where a weaker result, which was sufficient for the main results of the paper, was actually proved. Recently, Latała proved that in the case of $\alpha = 2$, the conclusion of Theorem 6.4 holds whenever the measure ν is log concave.

Related results on α -stable measures can be found in Lewandowski, Ryznar and Żak (1992). The key difference is that we need the right hand side of (6.1) to involve $\mu(B)$ for all B such that $\mu(B) \leq b$ and the constant R depending only on the number b .

Corollary 6.6. *Let $0 < \alpha \leq 2$, $0 < p, q$. If $\alpha = 2$ we assume that $q < \alpha$. If X is a α -stable, symmetric vector in a Banach space then $\|X\| \in \min \max \mathcal{H}_{p,q}(C)$ for some constant C which depends only on α, p and q .*

Proof. By the result of Szulga (1990) $\|X\| \in \max \mathcal{H}_{p,q}(C_1)$ for some constant C_1 which depends only on α, p, q . Theorems 6.4 and 3.4 imply that $\|X\| \in \min \mathcal{H}_{p,q}(C_2)$ where C_2 depends only on α, p, q . Therefore $\|X\| \in \min \max \mathcal{H}_{p,q}(C)$ with $C = C_1 \vee C_2$ ■

Corollary 6.7. *Let $0 < \alpha \leq 2$, $0 < p, q$. If $\alpha = 2$ we assume that $1 < q < \alpha$. Let $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n$ be symmetric α -stable, independent random vectors in a Banach space. Let $h : \mathbb{R}_+^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ be a function as in Theorem 5.3 which is λ -homogeneous for some λ . Then*

$$h(\|X_1\|, \|X_2\|, \dots, \|X_n\|) \in \min \max \mathcal{H}_{p,q}(C)$$

and the constant C depends only on α, p, q .

Proof. By Corollary 6.6 a constant σ can be found, which depends only on α, p, q and such that the conclusion of Lemma 5.1 holds true for $X = \|X_i\|$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$. Now we can proceed as in the proof of Theorem 5.3. ■

Theorem 6.8. *Let $Y = \max_{l \leq L} \|G\|_l$ and $X = \max_{l \leq L} \|G_l\|_l$, where the norms $\|\cdot\|_l$ were defined in Section 1. If*

$$(6.2) \quad \|m_n(Y)\|_q \leq C \|m_n(X)\|_q,$$

then for all $t \geq 0$

$$P(Y \leq ct) \geq P(X \leq t)$$

where the constant c is independent of dimension n , the number L and the norms $\|\cdot\|_l$.

Proof. In what follows, the statement that a constant is independent of everything means that the constant is independent of dimension n , the number L and the norms $\|\cdot\|_l$, but can depend on p, q and other absolute constants. In order to apply Theorem 5.4, we first need to show

$$(6.3) \quad \text{max hypercontractivity} \quad \|M_n(X)\|_q \leq C_1 \|M_n(X)\|_p,$$

$$(6.4) \quad \text{min hypercontractivity} \quad \|m_n(X)\|_q \leq C_2 \|m_n(X)\|_p,$$

and

$$(6.5) \quad \|M_n(Y)\|_q \leq C_3 \|M_n(X)\|_q$$

where constants C_1, C_2 and C_3 are independent of everything. In particular, the constant c is independent of everything.

To prove (6.3), note that $M_n(X)$ is a norm of Gaussian vectors. Thus by the hypercontractivity of norms of Gaussian vectors (cf. for example, Ledoux and Talagrand (1990), p. 60) we obtain that C_1 can be a constant independent of everything.

To prove (6.4), we use Proposition 6.3 to check the condition (iii) of Theorem 3.4. Taking $b = 1/2$, by Lemma 2.1 and (6.3), we can take λ close to 1, but independent of everything (depending on C_1, p and q only), such that

$$P(X \leq t) \leq b = 1/2$$

for all $t \leq t_0 = \lambda \|\max_{l \leq L} \|G_l\|_l\|_p$. Note that t_0 here is not independent of everything, but we are interested in the constant C_2 in (6.4) or C in (i) of Theorem 3.4. By Proposition 6.3, we have

$$P(X \leq st) \leq R s P(X \leq t) \quad \text{for all } 0 < s < 1 \quad \text{and for all } t \leq t_0.$$

For each $\varepsilon > 0$, taking $\tau = s = (\varepsilon/R) \wedge (1/2)$, we obtain

$$P(X \leq \tau t) \leq \varepsilon P(X \leq t) \quad \text{for all } t \leq t_0$$

which implies (6.4) by Theorem 3.4 with C_2 independent of everything. To see that the constant C_2 is independent of everything, we only need to follow the part of the proof from (iii) $\Rightarrow$ (iv) and (iv) $\Rightarrow$ (i) in Theorem 3.4. It is clear that τ and r in the proof is independent of everything and

$$C = \sigma^{-1} = \max \left\{ \|X\|_q / (E((\tau t_0) \wedge X)^p)^{1/p}, (\tau r)^{-1} \right\}.$$

Now note that

$$\begin{aligned} (E((\tau t_0) \wedge Y)^p)^{1/p} &\geq (\tau t_0) P^{1/p}(X \geq \tau t_0) \\ &= \tau \lambda \|X\|_p P^{1/p}(X \geq \lambda \tau \|X\|_p) \\ &\geq \tau \lambda \|X\|_p \cdot P^{1/p}(X \geq \lambda \tau \|X\|_p) \end{aligned}$$

and by Lemma 2.1 and (6.3)

$$P(X \geq \lambda \tau \|X\|_p) \geq ((1 - (\lambda \tau)^p) C_1^{-p})^{q/(q-p)}.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} C &= \max \left\{ \|X\|_q / (E((\tau t_0) \wedge X)^p)^{1/p}, (\tau r)^{-1} \right\} \\ &\geq \max \left\{ \|X\|_q / (\|X\|_p \tau \lambda (1 - (\lambda \tau)^p) C_1^{-p})^{q/p(q-p)}, (\tau r)^{-1} \right\} \\ &\geq \max \left\{ C_1 (\tau \lambda (1 - (\lambda \tau)^p) C_1^{-p})^{q/p(q-p)-1}, (\tau r)^{-1} \right\} \\ &= C_2 \end{aligned}$$

and it is clear that C_2 is independent of everything.

Finally, (6.5) follows from Slepian's lemma, see (1.2) and remarks following it.

Now we can apply Theorem 5.4 with (6.3), (6.4) and (6.5) in hand. We only need to show that σ in Lemma 5.1 is independent of everything in view of the proof of Theorem 5.4. To check that

$$\sigma = \min \left\{ \alpha t_0 / \|Y\|_q, \alpha / D, r / D, r \tau \right\}$$

in Lemma 5.1, is similar to the proof of (6.4) and is omitted here. Thus we finished the proof of Theorem 6.8. $\blacksquare$

As a consequence of Theorem 6.8, we have the following modified correlation inequality for centered Gaussian measure.

Corollary 6.9. (*modified correlation inequality*) Assume (6.2) holds. Then there exists an absolute constant α such that

$$(6.6) \quad \mu\left(\alpha\left(\bigcap_{i=1}^l A_i\right)\right) \geq \prod_{i=1}^l \mu(A_i)$$

for any centered Gaussian measure μ and any convex, symmetric sets A_i , $1 \leq i \leq l$ and $l \geq 1$.

Remark 6.10. Note that the original correlation conjecture (1.1) implies (6.6) with constant $c = 1$.

Section 7. Final remarks and some open problems.

In this section we mention a few results and open problems that are closely related to the main results in this paper. At first, we give a very simple proof of the following result.

Proposition 7.1. For $0 < p < q < \infty$, if there exists a constant C , such that for all n ,

$$(7.1) \quad \|M_n(X)\|_q \leq C \|M_n(X)\|_p$$

then the following are equivalent:

(i) There exists a constant C , such that for all n ,

$$(7.2) \quad \|M_n(Y)\|_p \leq C \|M_n(X)\|_p;$$

(ii) There exists a constant C such that

$$(7.3) \quad P(Y > t) \leq C \cdot P(X > t).$$

Proof. It follows from de la Peña, Montgomery-Smith and Szulga (1994) that the hypercontractivity of X , (7.1), and the domination relation (7.2) imply the tail domination (7.3). So we only need to show that (ii) implies (i). Without loss of generality, we assume $C > 1$. Let δ be an independent random variable with

$$P(\delta = 1) = 1/C, \quad P(\delta = 0) = 1 - 1/C.$$

Then for all n and all $t \geq 0$

$$\begin{aligned} P(M_n(\delta Y) < t) &= P^n(\delta Y < t) = (1 - P(\delta Y \geq t))^n = (1 - C^{-1}P(Y \geq t))^n \\ &\geq (1 - P(X \geq t))^n = P(M_n(X) < t) \end{aligned}$$

which implies $\|M_n(\delta Y)\|_p \leq \|M_n(X)\|_p$. On the other hand, we have

$$E_Y E_\delta \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} (\delta_i Y_i^p) \geq E_Y \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} E_\delta (\delta_i Y_i^p) = C^{-1} E Y_i^p.$$

which finishes the proof. ■

Our next proposition is related to Theorem 6.4.

Proposition 7.2. *Let μ be a probability measure on a separable, Banach space F . Then for any closed, symmetric, convex set $B \subseteq F$, the following are equivalent:*

(i) *For each $b < 1$, there exist $R = R(b) > 1$ and $\beta > 0$ such that for all $0 \leq t \leq 1$,*

$$(7.4) \quad \mu(tB) \leq R(b)t^\beta \mu(B), \text{ whenever } \mu(B) \leq b.$$

(ii) *For each $b < 1$, there exists $r = r(b) < 1$ such that for all $t \geq 0$,*

$$(7.5) \quad \int_0^t \mu(sB) ds \leq r(b)t\mu(tB), \text{ whenever } \mu(B) \leq b.$$

Proof. We first prove (i) implies (ii). Take $\delta < 1$ such that $\delta^\beta = (1 + \beta)^{-1} R^{-1}$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^t \mu(sB) ds &= \int_0^{\delta t} \mu(sB) ds + \int_{\delta t}^t \mu(sB) ds \\ &\leq \int_0^{\delta t} \delta \mu(\delta(sB)) ds + (1 - \delta)t\mu(tB) \\ &\leq R\delta^{1+\beta} \int_0^{\delta t} \mu(sB) ds + (1 - \delta)t\mu(tB) \\ &\leq (1 - \delta + R\delta^{1+\delta})t\mu(tB) \\ &= (1 - \beta(1 + \beta)^{-1}\delta)t\mu(tB). \end{aligned}$$

Thus (ii) holds with $r(b) = 1 - \beta(1 + \beta)^{-1}\delta < 1$.

To prove (ii) implies (i), note that for $\delta = 1 - r^{1/2} > 0$

$$\int_0^t \mu(sB) ds \geq \int_{\delta t}^t \mu(sB) ds \geq (1 - \delta)t\mu(\delta tB) = r^{1/2}t\mu(\delta tB)$$

and thus from (7.5), for any $t > 0$,

$$(7.6) \quad \mu(\delta t B) \leq r^{1/2} \mu(t B).$$

Now for any $0 < s < 1$, pick $k \geq 0$ such that $\delta^{k+1} \leq s < \delta^k$. We have by the iteration of (7.6) that

$$\mu(s B) \leq \mu(\delta^k B) \leq r^{1/2} \mu(\delta^{k-1} B) \leq r^{k/2} \mu(B).$$

Thus by using $k + 1 \geq \log s / \log \delta$, we obtain

$$\mu(s B) \leq r^{k/2} \mu(B) \leq r^{-1/2} s^{\log r / (2 \log \delta)} \mu(B)$$

which finishes the proof with $R = r^{-1/2} > 1$ and $\beta = \log r / (2 \log \delta) > 0$. ■

There are many questions related to this work. Let us only mention a few here.

Conjecture 7.3. *The best min-hypercontractive constant in (6.4) with $Y = \|X\|$ for symmetric Gaussian vectors X in any Banach space is*

$$C = \frac{\Gamma^{1/q}(q)}{\Gamma^{1/p}(p)}.$$

The constant follows from the small ball estimates, $P(|X| < s) \sim K \cdot s$ as $s \rightarrow 0$, of one-dimensional Gaussian random variable X . Note that if $\beta > 1$ and $P(|X| < s) \sim K \cdot s^\beta$ as $s \rightarrow 0$, then the resulting constant in this case is smaller. Thus the conjecture looks reasonable in view of Proposition 6.3.

A related question is that under hyper-max condition, what can we say about a nontrivial lower bound for $\|M_{k+1}\|_p / \|M_k\|_p$, and in particular, in the Gaussian case. This maybe useful in proving the conjecture.

A result of Gordon (1987) compares the expected minima of maxima for, in particular, Gaussian processes. We mention this here because a version of Gordon's results could perhaps be used to prove the next Conjecture. Note that if the conjecture holds, then the modified correlation inequality C_α holds.

Conjecture 7.4. *Let G , G_l and norm $\|\cdot\|_l$ be as in Section 1. If $Y = \max_{l \leq L} \|G\|_l$ and $X = \max_{l \leq L} \|G_l\|_l$, then*

$$\|m_n(Y)\|_q \leq C \|m_n(X)\|_q.$$

Our next conjecture is related to stable measures. It is a stronger statement than our Proposition 6.4 and holds for the symmetric Gaussian measures.

Conjecture 7.5. *Let ν be a symmetric α stable measure with $0 < \alpha \leq 2$ on a separable, Banach space F . Then for any closed, symmetric, convex set $B \subseteq F$ and for each $b < 1$, there exists $R(b)$ such that for all $0 \leq t \leq 1$,*

$$\nu(tB) \leq R(b)t\nu(B), \text{ whenever } \nu(B) \leq b.$$

Note also that the following S-conjecture will provide the best constant $R(b)$ for the symmetric Gaussian measures in Theorem 6.4, (6.1). See Kwapien and Sawa (1993) for history and a proof of the conjecture for 1-unconditional set.

S-Conjecture. *Let μ be a symmetric Gaussian measure on a separable Banach space F . Then for any closed, symmetric, convex set $B \subseteq F$,*

$$\mu(\lambda B) \geq \mu(\lambda S)$$

for each $\lambda > 1$ and each symmetric slab S in F such that $\mu(S) \geq \mu(B)$.

Bibliography

- Anderson, T.W. (1955). The integral of a symmetric unimodal function over a symmetric convex set and some probability inequalities. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **6**, 170–176.
- Asmar, N. H., Montgomery-Smith, S.J. (1994). On the distribution of Sidon series. *Ark. Mat.* **31**, 13–26.
- Bingham, N. H., Goldie, C. M. and Teugels, J. L. (1987). Regular variation. *Cambridge University Press*, 491 pp.
- De la Peña, V., Montgomery-Smith, S.J. and Szulga, J. (1994). Contraction and decoupling inequalities for multilinear forms and U-statistics. *Ann. of Prob.* **22**, 1745–1765.
- Gordon, Y. (1987). Elliptically contoured distributions. *Prob. Theory Rel. Fields* **76**, 429–438.
- Khatri, C.G. (1967). On certain inequalities for normal distributions and their applications to simultaneous confidence bounds. *Ann. Math. Statist.* **38**, 1853–1867.
- Kuelbs, J., Li, W.V. and Shao, Q. (1995). Small ball estimates for fractional Brownian motion under Hölder norm and Chung’s functional LIL. *J. Theor. Prob.* **8**, 361–386.
- Kwapień, S. and Sawa, J. (1993), On some conjecture concerning Gaussian measures of dilatations of convex symmetric sets, *Studia Math.* **105**, 173–187.
- Ledoux, M. and Talagrand, M. (1991). *Probability on Banach Spaces*, Springer, Berlin.
- Lewandowski, M., Ryznar, M. and Żak, T. (1992). Stable measure of a small ball, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **115**, 489–494.
- Li, W.V. and Shao, Q. (1995). The existence of the small ball constant for sup-norm of fractional Brownian motion under the correlation conjecture. (notes).
- Marcus, M. B. and Shepp, L. (1972). Sample behavior of Gaussian processes. *Proc. of the Sixth Berkeley Symposium on Math. Statist. and Prob.* **vol. 2**, 423–441
- Pitt, L.D. (1977). A Gaussian correlation inequality for symmetric convex sets. *Ann. of Prob.* **5**, 470–474.

- Rychlik, E. (1993). Some necessary and sufficient conditions of (p, q) hypercontractivity. Preprint.
- Schechtman, G., Schlumprecht, T. and Zinn, J. (1995). On the Gaussian measure of the intersection of symmetric, convex sets. Preprint.
- Šidák, Z. (1967) Rectangular confidence regions for the means of multivariate normal distributions. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **62**, 626–633.
- Šidák, Z. (1968). On multivariate normal probabilities of rectangles: their dependence on correlations. *Ann. Math. Statist.* **39**, 1425–1434.
- Slepian, D. (1962). The one-sided barrier problem for Gaussian noise. *Bell System Tech. J.* **41**, 463–501.
- Szarek, S. (1991). Conditional numbers of random matrices. *J. Complexity*, **7**, 131–149.
- Szarek, S. and Werner, E. (1995). Personal Communication.
- Szulga, J. (1990). A note on hypercontractivity of stable random variables. *Ann. of Prob.* **18**, 1746–1758.
- Talagrand, M. (1994). The small ball problem for the Brownian sheet. *Ann. of Probab.* **22**, 1331–1354.
- Tong, Y. L. (1980). *Probability Inequalities in Multivariate Distributions*, Academic Press, New York.

P. Hitczenko

Department of Mathematics,
North Carolina State University
Raleigh, NC 27695–8205, USA

W. V. Li

Department of Mathematics,
University of Delaware
Newark, DE 19716, USA

T. Schlumprecht

Department of Mathematics
Texas A&M University
College Station, TX 77843–3368, USA

S. Kwapien

Institute of Mathematics
Warsaw University
Banacha 2, 02-097 Warsaw, Poland

G. Schechtman

Department of Theoretical Mathematics
The Weizmann Institute of Science
Rehovot, Israel

J. Zinn

Department of Mathematics
Texas A&M University
College Station, TX 77843–3368, USA